

Appl. No. 10/648,523
Amdt. dated January 10, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of August 5, 2005 and
Reply to Advisory Action of November 2, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-62 are pending in the instant application. Claims 22-57 have been withdrawn in a previous action. Claims 1, 4, 8-12, 16-20 and 58 have been amended and claims 3, 7 and have been canceled. Claims 63-72 have been added, leaving claims 1, 4-6, 8-21, 58-72 for consideration. Claims 1, 3-5, 19, 21, 58-60, and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). Further, claims 6, 20 and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner has indicated that claims 7-18 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants cordially thank the Examiner for indication of the same. The Examiner has also indicated that the disclosure is objected to due to informalities. The Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 1, 4, 9-12, 16-20 and 58 have been amended, claims 3, 7 and 8 have been canceled and claims 63-72 have been newly added. The Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-6, 9-21 and 58-72 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons presented herein. This supplemental amendment may be substituted for the amendment filed on January 5, 2006. The present supplemental amendment differs only with respect to the newly added claims 63-72 relative to the amendment filed on January 5, 2006. No new matter has been entered by this amendment.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3-5, 19, 21, 58-60 and 62 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0181223 A1 to Ryu et al. (hereinafter "Ryu"). Claim 1 has been amended to recite a light guide plate comprising "a light reflection pattern formed on the first light emission surface, for reflecting light toward the second light emission surface, the light reflection pattern including a plurality of dots, *wherein the dots each have light reflecting surfaces elongated in a selected direction, wherein adjacent ones of the light reflecting surfaces meet each other at elongated edges of the adjacent light reflecting surfaces to form an angle between the adjacent reflecting surfaces.*" Ryu does not recite these

LW8091US/JJ
21C-0065

Appl. No. 10/648,523
Amdt. dated January 10, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of August 5, 2005 and
Reply to Advisory Action of November 2, 2005

features. Rather Ryu teaches a light guide panel in which a plurality of micro cells are formed on the surface. As shown and described in FIGs. 6a and 6b, a contour of each cell defines an embossment pattern and an intaglio pattern, respectively. Further, Ryu teaches a contour of each cell formed on a bottom of a depression defined on the surface of the light guide panel as shown in FIGs. 7a and 7b, whereby the cell is composed of a plurality of micro cells defining an embossment pattern and an intaglio pattern, respectively. Thus, Ryu is devoid of teaching "dots each [having] light reflecting surfaces elongated in a selected direction, wherein adjacent ones of the light reflecting surfaces meet each other at elongated edges of the adjacent light reflecting surfaces to form an angle between the adjacent reflecting surfaces" as recited in Applicants' claim 1. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ryu and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejection. Claims 3-5 and 19 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 3-5 and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections.

Claim 58 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to recite a light guide plate comprising "a light reflection pattern formed on the first light emission surface, for reflecting light toward the second light emission surface, the light reflection pattern including a plurality of dots, each of the dots having a prism pattern formed on a corresponding dot, *the prism pattern elongated in a specific direction.*" Ryu does not teach these features. As indicated above with respect to claim 1, Ryu teaches a contour of each cell defines an embossment pattern and an intaglio pattern, respectively. Further, Ryu teaches a contour of each cell formed on a bottom of a depression defined on the surface of the light guide panel as shown in FIGs. 7a and 7b, whereby the cell is composed of a plurality of micro cells defining an embossment pattern and an intaglio pattern, respectively. Ryu is devoid of teaching "each of the dots having a prism pattern formed on a corresponding dot, the prism pattern elongated in a specific direction" as recited in Applicants' claim 58. According, the Applicants submit that claim 58 is not anticipated by Ryu and respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejection. Claims 59, 60 and 62

LW8091US/JJ
21C-0065

Appl. No. 10/648,523
Amdt. dated January 10, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of August 5, 2005 and
Reply to Advisory Action of November 2, 2005

depend from what should be an allowable claim 58. For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that claims 59, 60, and 62 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections.

Furthermore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner admits that Ryu fails to disclose "the geometrically regular pattern [e.g., prism pattern] formed on each dots to be elongated in a specific direction" on page 4 of the detailed Action of the Advisory Action mailed November 2, 2005. However, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to shape the geometrically regular pattern as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 58, including dependent claims 59, 60 and 62 is improper under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), since Ryu admittedly does not teach all of the elements as claimed. For at least this reason as well, the Applicants submit that the rejection to claims 58-60 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 20, and 61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Ryu in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,390,436 issued to Ashall.

Claims 6 and 20 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claim 61 depends from what should be an allowable claim 58. For at least these reasons, it is believed that claims 6, 20, and 61 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

New claim 63 is believed to patentable over Ryu and also over Ryu in view of Ashall. Claim 63 recites a light guide plate comprising "a light reflection pattern formed on the first light emission surface, for reflecting light toward the second light emission surface, the light reflection pattern including a plurality of dots, each of the dots having a prism pattern formed on a corresponding dot, wherein dots each have light reflecting surfaces elongated in a selected direction." For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 58, it is believed that new claim 63 is in condition for allowance.

LW8091US/JJ
21C-0065

New claim 64 is believed to patentable over Ryu and also over Ryu in view of Ashall. Claim 64 recites a light guide plate comprising "a light reflection pattern formed on the first light emission surface, for reflecting light toward the second light emission surface, the light reflection pattern including a plurality of protruding dots on the first light emission surface, wherein each of dots has a geometrically regular pattern." For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 58, it is believed that new claim 64, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 65-72, are in condition for allowance.

LW8091US/CS
21C-0063

Page 11 of 12


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43, 801
Confirmation No. 4676
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: January 10, 2006

LW8091US/CS
21C-0065

Page 12 of 12